

Lower Paxton Township  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES**

May 01, 2013

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Frederick Lighty  
Ernest Gingrich  
Roy Newsome  
Dennis Guise  
Douglas Grove  
Robin Lindsey

**ALSO PRESENT**

Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer  
Stephen Fleming, Township Engineer, HRG Inc.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Lighty called the regular meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00pm, on the above date in Room 171 of the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

Mr. Guise led the recitation of the Pledge.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Lighty asked about the April 2013 minutes. Ms. Moran said they would be available next meeting. Mr. Lighty said okay to that.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Mr. Lighty asked if there was any old business. The response was there was not any at this time.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Land Development Plan  
For Longhorn Steakhouse #13-06**

Ms. Moran presented to the Township the plans for the development of a new Longhorn Steakhouse Restaurant. Ms. Moran states that the Commission Members have the HRG comments and the County comments in their packets. The restaurant will be constructed in the Sears parking lot at the Colonial Park Mall. The property[M1] is zoned CG Commercial General, consists of 12.459 acres and is served by public sewer and water. The plan proposes a 6,275 square foot restaurant on a leased area of 0.3470 acre. The plan shows a reduction of 4,683 square foot in impervious coverage. The plan also proposes a

sidewalk and street trees along the new development frontage as well as interior landscaping. The property is located north of U.S. Route 22 just east of Colonial Road.

#### Waiver Requests:

The applicant has requested the following waivers:

1. Waiver of the requirement to provide a preliminary plan. [180.303.a] Staff Supports
2. Waiver of the requirement to provide landscaping within all landscaped islands throughout the 12.4597 acre site. [180-515.C frontage.(4)] Staff Supports
3. Waiver of the requirement to provide street trees seventy five (75) feet on center. The plan proposes on street trees one hundred (100) feet on center along the development area frontage. [180.505.D] Staff Does Not Support

Mike Jeitner from Bohler Engineering is representing Rare Hospitality International Inc., and Longhorn Steakhouse. He provided a general overview of the proposed Longhorn Steakhouse development in the portion of the Colonial Park Mall in front of Sears, this is the vacant pad that is at the corner of the main access of the Sears lot and Route 22, right now it's a macadam parking lot area. The proposal is for a 6200 square foot Longhorn Steakhouse within that vacant area. The plan proposes to maintain the access points to and from the center and utilize the access drives in turn of the center try to minimize, as much as possible, the impact on the overall parking. The plan is to reduce and refurbish coverage by adding landscaping within the front of the site and along RT. 22. Dianne noted approximately 4600 square feet of additional landscaping. This plan was also proposed displacing some of the parking at the site. Today the site gains control of the overall 12.45 acre lot to 1.3. The overall parking requirement places the existing buildings with any calculation also the Longhorn Steakhouse with the total requirement of 618 parking spaces the site today gains 787 spaces as part of the close development will be displacing some of the parking spaces obviously reducing the total to 717 still approximately 100 parking spaces more than what is required by the ordinance. As part of the plan and part of the due diligence the plan was submitted there was a meeting with PENNDOT to discuss the proposal since we are adding to the use and the access points of Route 22. That meeting was held with the representative from Darden Restaurants traffic engineer Jeff Fiore, Steve Fleming from your group was also at that meeting as a result of that meeting we ended up revising the south western driveway to the PENNDOT concerns. What the plan ended up revising, going back to the original plan that was submitted. The original plan was the driveway aligned the front driveway lined with Route 22 and the access point now the further end here will be maintained as part of that, referring to this area in front here located along Route 22 the plans that reviews and submitted by PENNDOT. The driveway aligned with Route 22 and not modifying the southern driveway and western driveway and during that meeting PENNDOT had concerns regarding that access, if you are familiar with that access today, going back to that area photo this location now this spot on Jonestown Rd. the access point we have a very minor landscape strip within that area really this driveway as you come into the site there really is no throat within that driveway, that's one of PENNDOT'S main concerns as we provide really some throat distance as you come into the site so we have time to maneuver not only cars coming off Route 22 but also cars coming in to the site if you are familiar with that intersection its kinda wide open as you come thru that area. The plan was revised as part of that meeting and we wanted to present that to the Planning Commission because this is feedback from PENNDOT the number of comments to go through but the purpose is we revise that driveway to the residents of that area submitted consentual plan back to

PENNDOT with that revised configuration of the generally conceived positive feedback from them regards to the configuration in which they were desiring. With this revision we added the green area in front, it is ordinarily macadam. Really when we take a look at this area here the curblin would come up to close to this island here as you come into the site all this here will be landscape a drastic improvement along this street frontage, this plan also by adding that landscaping safeguard our curbish coverage reduction as noted as the subpressly as 4600 now up to 13,000 square feet of reduced curbage coverage which is a benefit. Now from a parking stand point we revised this plan and really offset a lot of this parking but referring back to prior plan we did not have parking in the front here so even with the exchanges we end up with only one (1) less parking space than what was on the previous plan. So the parking is generally the same magnitude as the plan still in conformance with the ordinance regarding overall parking. An improvement over what we have previously that's the plan we are preceding thru and will be part of the revised plan submitted to the Township for review. The main configuration of the building take a look around the building itself, main entranceway in front here and its major present is our main entrance to our building the sidewalk wraps around the building, parking goes along the west side of the building where ADA access with 6 ADA spaces. The match up back to the existing drive aisle is within the center back to the one-way drive aisle to get to the back of the restaurant this is our closed trash enclosure area here with locked gates. I will show you some of the features; elevations. Getting back to the existing site we are getting around the perimeter of our group were trying to confine everything within that front area better representation as the overall plan. Back to the parking stalls, the stalls located and that leaves a good 18 -16-18-17 stalls remaining as part of that Sears area, if you are familiar with that site, really if you get beyond that point look its just a macadam area. Sears has reviewed this plan as well and is satisfied with the displacement of parking and coming back to revision regarding the parking aisle and drive by aisle just beyond the rear of our building. I will give you a quick representation of what the building will look like so you can kinda get an idea as you are driving along the route also the interior of the center. The top elevation represents the front elevation facing Route 22 this is our main access, main entrance, for our customers the front. The bottom elevation here is the elevation facing the main access way to the mall itself, coming up the main drive off of Route 22 up through the center of the site the easterly side of the building itself. The two remaining sides of course the top elevation and the rear elevation facing the Sears itself and the left elevation, west elevation will be elevation facing the Jewelry store on that side the other access point we were referring to. They take their as you can see in the architecture, it's a very unique and very attractive building the landscaping itself around the building itself is very unique they take pride in regards to their general appearance of the building and landscaping around the building itself, as far as the results. I know we have a number of comments and I have had the chance to speak with your engineer regarding some of the comments, I have a had a chance to review Steves' letter specifically probably about 95 percent of the comments are being revised and we are actually in the process of providing those plans to resubmit those in the next couple of days here back to the Township we are cleaning up that letter, we do have a couple comments that the Planning Commission would like to go thru one (1) by one (1). Mr. Jeitner asks if there are any questions regarding the plan before he goes to the letter at all?

Mr. Lighty says for general speaking he likes PENNDOTs' recommendation for the plans and to see how far the select driveways. My concern though are the spaces in front and to the west are gonna fill up. Where are the majority of the customers gonna park in the back ?

Mr. Jeitner responds the main area here we have 5 spaces in the corner back and the majority of the parking will be in the back and spill over. The back parking row here beyond that two-way drive by

Mr .Lighty asks between that area, how many spaces are facing this side?

Mr. Jeitner responds in the front of the site 96 spaces.

Mr. Lighty states that's is not nearly enough.

Mr. Jeitner responds that he understands and that is why there is spill over parking

Mr. Lighty states that spill over parking behind is only for the cars and I have no intentional of walking all around the front with the sidewalk on the west side

Mr. Jeitner states either side the sidewalk on the westside will take you to the front of the restaurant, will also have a sidewalk on the eastside to take you to the front of the restaurant.

Mr. Lighty asks where that sidewalk is gonna be lined is something out near the parking lot? Or are people gonna be walking up and down parking aisles till they get to the center?

Mr. Jeitner answers specially what we see with out parking typically you do not see with crosswalks presented in actually presents conflict where you have a conflict with pedestrian and a vehicle in that area. Plus, we have the locations of the parking conversing to the front of the site with the sidewalk which really needed in that area providing the sidewalk area to give easy access to and from the front of the building in 2 (two) locations typically do not need to have additional crosswalk within that area, this area here as much as part of the overall here even this driveby can be utilized by customers of the restaurant.

Mr. Lighty asks use the rest of your customers parking similar to the parking where your stalls are. I am concerned with the safety to the car.

Mr. Gingrich asks about the C13 calculations there are 152 spaces required

Mr. Newsome asks where are they?

Mr. Jeitner responds that 152 needs to we can alleviate those spaces as part of the lease of the overall mall there is shared parking, shared parking over the entire mall. We talk about 152 and we have 100 within this location here an additional 50 stalls up in this area in front of Sears.

Mr. Newsome comments that they go in they have to go across that access road that your putting in the 52 or whatever the number is just to the north of that road.

Mr. Jeitner responds correct, some of that is filled with parking and would cross over than.

Mr. Newsome says 1/3 of your parking.

Mr. Jeitner states correct.

Mr. Lighty responds 2/3 of customers and parking situation in many restaurants are just horrible. Is there anything we can do I am not suggesting repainting crosswalks. Can it be relined or something to that effect? Laid out in the plans, you want the front of your restaurant facing Route 22, where people cannot really park. They have to park somewhere else and walk. The restaurants in our area, the Red Robin. Can someone explain to me how that works, they have a hand full of parking spaces right by the west side of the restaurant their front door is facing north but to park your somewhere else back in the shear back. I don't want a situation like that here getting any wider in the parking lot. If we can help it.

Mr. Jeitner states your building below the lines suggesting maybe to a potential crosswalk and a sign location that would be below the line.

Mr. Lighty responds that you could probably accomplish most of my concern with nothing more than the proper lining. But I gave some thought to begin with all the majority of the government and by the restaurant and we walk around.

Mr. Jeitner states we will take a look around.

Mrs. Lindsey asks where will the employees park when they come to work?

Mr. Jeitner responds most likely the employees will be parking on this location here, further away. The parking calculation proves that employees are in that 152 spaces.

Mr. Newsome states he too is concerned with the parking. I would like for you to address the issue with the parking requirements. You have profused certain number of parking spaces based on the total parking somewhere, is this just the number of parking for here computed or what about Bon Ton and the Jewelry store?

Mr. Jeitner answers this line this road point 12.46 equal lines we wrote that.

Mr. Newsome says excuse me. Show me the outlines for that here, to the other side of the Sears, you say.

Mr. Jeitner answers correct

Mr. Newsome asks all of Sears?

Mr. Jeitner states correct. We prepared the calculations for the required the yard our own lot although the access to and from the locations of the mall We prepared the calculations we looked at of all the uses of the entrances overall and supply parking that's within that area. Thats how we looked at the overall parking calculation which is consistant with the prior planning approval

Mr. Newsome asks did you look at the parking for those other businesses that face within that area that you are talking about? Another words there are usually. There are commercial use to the west along the main building that are not Sears and Roebuck. I guess it would be to use your pointer there to point out the area that you would concur.

Mr. Jeitner states the property line on the side of the building wall. Really that is the property line that extends back when we take a look at that, we look at the parking calculation of that. We can line the parking lot.

Mr. Newsome asks so you can limit the parking at Sears Automobile Service area.

Mr. Jeitner states to be specific we have the Sears building here and Enterprise building here and we have the Sears over here and of course the Longhorn.

Mr. Newsome so you are presenting your parking hypothetically on everything in that area.

Mr. Jeitner states correct both requirement and provided. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Newsome asks if this consists with our current parking requirements?

Ms. Moran states, yes it does.

Mr. Lighty remarks that he has no doubt that it does have enough parking spaces. I know there is enough room in the parking lot. I want to know if there is enough parking for Black Friday and Christmas? I don't want the problems of other restaurants.

Mr. Jeitner states we will look at tradition.

Mr. Newsome asks if he has not prepared landscaping plan for that area that would be modified?

Mr. Jeitner states they are in the process of doing that, what I guess we can review letter will go in this week thru Darden, one of the potential waivers from the current list.

Mr. Lighty asks after the throat what is that plan to do with area?

Mr. Jeitner state we have created a landscape island within that area

Mr. Lighty asks if people can go right into those spots?

Mr. Jeitner states provided that travel path where it stays just what we counted.

Mr. Jeitner refers to the letter dated April 18<sup>th</sup> page 1(one) we had 3(three) waivers requested:

1. The submission of the preliminary plan looking at this as the preliminary/final ,the staff supports that waiver.
2. Providing landscaping at all the islands within the mall itself and donating and providing the landscaping around the profuse, the waiver requests is really providing that requirement around the entire mall. I believe that is the entire mines. I believe that also is supported by staff within the other peoples main portion and the other portion of the track around the site is landscape island and provide landscaping.

Mr. Newsome asks if they will not provide landscaping on that modification that you were talking about?

Mr. Jeitner states, we will.

Mr. Newsome states thats beyond the area in which you were talking about.

Mr. Jeitner I am really referring to the development area, we have landscaping with that.

The third waiver has to do with street trees and I will apologize before we had probably had the wrong section with in the ordinance, we had 180-505.D and the correct section should be 5.15.D 1A which means two (2) street trees requirements and one ( 1) in every state capital ,one ( 1) in every 6 feet. What we had back to the prior plan. What we had originally space out was one (1) per 100 feet, were really talking about the westerly driveway up to the main driveway in the track. The prior waiver request was having them spaced at 1 per 800 feet with a notion as misrepresentation they require 1 per every 75 feet, the correct location is 1 per every 50 feet were looking for a waiver to permit 1 per every 75 feet what would recessitate really would look at this plan here. Right now we are showing 3 trees and would end up with 5 trees in the front, with the 75 foot lineage. As with the 50 foot requirement would take us somewhere in the 6 to 7 tree range.

Mr. Lighty asks what is the applicant percentage of our order? There is a member of the Shade Tree Commission here, ask an expert. I know you revised, but your reasons for that. I assume you want to plant less because you have a lot of construction. Mr. Lighty inquired what motivates the changes?

Mr. Jeitner states really the visibilty along that area.

Mr. Lighty states it is a pretty wide open area and could use a little sprucing up.

Mr. Jeitner states let me submit this to the Planning Commission, we need to revise the plans with that large landscape area in the front. What we would like to do is go back and were gonna come back to the Planning Commission anyway with the revised plan. At that time we will look at see if we can talk to the client and talk to our park line regards to the 1 for 50 show them that see where we are going to be, if we can remove the waiver we will if not we will at least have a plan to present to the Planning Commission with the next set of revisions .If we do request a waiver we will be able to see formally what that tree row will look like regards to the specifications. Understanding where the Planning Commission is based on your statement on the Shade Trees, take that under advisement regards to looking at the ordinance.

Mr. Newsome asks how did they get that visibility problems? You know we may well be at minimial, an average of every 50 feet .So if you move some for visibility problems may be you should do some actual design .Still get the number of trees.

Mr. Jeitner agrees great point, I think we could move them around a bit and I take the areas in certain spaces. I think we have an opportunity here with that to move, maybe a location waiver. We will come up with revision. We have a meeting based off the staffs' comments on that. We will look at that so hopefully regards what to do in that section.

Mr. Jeiner states going on with the letter the Zoning Ordinance Section, I will just hits the ones if I don't speak of them there was no compliance.

Page 2 item # 10- verify park requirements per section, Speaking with Steve it was just clarification revised plans you will have revised calculations on the plan regarding revised configurations there with no need to be parting they are still well within the ordinance required.

11. Had to do with adding 6-88 space that I will comply and add that to our plan.

12. Has to do with a 20 foot wide planning strip from the right of way. As I noted earlier we are adding a significant amount of landscaping to the front here, if you are familiar with the site we will look at the arial, there is a very minor grass strip that exists today in that area. So non- conforming condition that we are improving along the front we take a look at that area one area slightly less than the 20 foot area we have about a 16 foot area within a pinch point of where there are parking spaces to ascend to that area. Now common sense would say just remove a parking space or 2 and make the requirement 20 but these are obviously prime parking spaces in the front there. I would submit to the Planning Commission maybe this more of the Zoning Officers view of this, we are obviously improving that non-conforming significant waste with the amount of landscaping we are adding along Route 22 in fact we are talking less than 20 feet in that area its an extreme improvement over the existing condition of now.

Mr. Lighty asks is it set at 16.

Mr. Jeitner responds 15.9.

Mr. Lighty states that Steve and Dianne something to work on. Thank You.

Mr. Jeitner states that the rest of the Zoning comments are on reply. Other than the subdivision on page 2 comment number 18, looks like we are looking for a waiver sheet size with the add on that we would reach the reduced sheet size the time we were recording for those plans to be recorded. The rationality of my night the nice the sheet size we have is based off a 10 sheet scale plan, contractor needs to review the plan, the main purpose of having the sheet.

Mr. Lighty asks if having the right sheet for filing or reviewing? The sheet size an issue.

Mr. Jeitner states we have Weaver at that point. Do we agree to have that recorded?

Mr. Lighty we agree to have that recorded.

Mr. Jeitner responds I will look at it in our response.

Mr. Guise asks what size?

Mr. Jeitner responds its 30 by 40.

Mr. Jeitner says the rest of the comments on page 2 comply as are all the subdivision comments on page 3. Moving on to page 4 the comment 44 has to do with the street tree requirement and that is the waiver we spoke of earlier. The potential waiver and we will address that in the revised plan. Discussed in the next Planning Commission Meeting the rest of the comments thru that section will comply. Moving on to page 5, comment, we have 2 comments here from the result of the PENNDOT meeting problem 58- skip over to 59 first. 59- has to do with that driveway we spoke of, that is a modified item 59 something Penndot has requested be submitted a central plan to them and it is something that we are doing as part of this plan. Comment 58 has to do with the main access drive to the mall itself. As referring to the main access way to the center of the mall thru the front area. Unfortunately I was not at the Penndot meeting a representative from Darden was there indicated that his recollection was that the main focus from Penndot was the Westerly driveway as part of improving that speed, really the location of the access point and the lack of manuvre area thru that area in the throat. It is really the detention of the proposed plan to focus on this portion of the overall mall, to get into the growth or main access getting to the center. That is something that is part of this plan for my client there focus of developing their portion of the mall line. They can start to improve upon other portions within the mall that are really out of their development area. I know there is probably going to be further discussion on this. Steve you have an opinion on this regarding your meeting with PENNDOT.

Steve responds that that point was discussed at the PENNDOT meeting and also has been a point of discussion with the staff thru the sketch plan process. Sketch plan process thru the very first concept plan that was submitted the discussion staff has recommendation of improvement of that entrance to the mall thru parcel. Right now its admitted by the guiderail that is a large understrip portion on the opposite side of the drive that access the Sears Tire and Battery that's commonly coned off with stacks tires or rope. The comment at the PENNDOT meeting was obviously was the shopping center tries to restrict motorists to travel thru there the guiderail indicts that there were issues in the past, making improvements to enter of the mall we should address those concerns making it a more pleasing entrance to the mall. As well as there is cutting thru traffic that uses this intersection to travel the back side of mall and cut corner of the north side and that traffic doesn't stop properly at the front of the Sears shopping center because there is not signage properly. There are letters to the property requested additional signage since then asked, not with resent success. We are continuing to request that the access drive gets improved as part of this development.

Mr. Lighty asks what do we do about that?



Steve responds that I scaled it off the plan and it appears that the access driveway is 30 plus feet wide from the existing guiderail to the existing guiderail. I recommend that you restrict parking on either side that potentially narrowing that access driveway down enough to create curbing and grass island and landscape island on either side of the access drive. Its both to a point that the intersection by Sears with proper signage and formal intersection. Maybe some line stripping will all work together to provide some internal traffic patterns.

Mr. Lighty says under our ordinances do we have the authority to have a part in this?

Steve replys that they are developing this property so its.

Mr. Lighty responds he is leasing just an overall parcel its not universal.

Steve says the only restriction is at the entrance that I am aware of and you may want to ask the solicitors, the public and talk to him internally on site, so you have the ability.

Mr. Lighty says do as he says that's is a ball park, How much of a burden are we asking?

Steve says that was the conversation I believe the applicant several times with all of the parties, to cut out the existing paving and install curbing and landscaping you are probably looking at 40,000 dollars to 50,000 dollars. The discussion a large numerical point included a sidewalk and curbing. I think a significant portion of the traffic is going to access this restaurant, is going to travel that access drive, and contribute so its logical improvement.

Mr. Lighty asks how do you feel about that to Mr. Jeitner?

Mr. Jeitner states it is a bone of contention. The only thing I can say to your Planning Commission I can take those, I can take those comments back .Really noted and in the review letter.

Mr. Lighty says it would be a benefit to Darden and Sears, to have them make and spend on these improvements.

Mr. Jeitner states he does not disagree to improve that, thru that area. Something I can take back to my client and see where they are at.

Mr. Gingrich asks if there is no access to driveway and to Sears?

Mr. Jeitner states that's is correct, that's consistant with the way it is today.

Mr. Gingrich says it fills up to Sears.

Mr. Lighty states it stacks.

Mr. Jeitner responds that he will discuss that with his client. He says Dianne this has been a discussion point. He doesn't disagree with that

Mr. Newsome says seriously, participating.

Mr. Lighty states good point, I would like to ask how it would benefit Lower Paxton Township, Mall, Sears and Longhorn.

Mr. Newsome says the Mall?

Mr. Lighty responds the Whole Mall.

Mr. Jeitner states really the rest of the review letter will defy it as we had a chance to speak to Steve regarding some of the former items some of the items are exempt , reduce the curbage coverage and some other items regards for clarification items.

Mrs. Lindsey asks that she has a question about the Fire Marshalls comment? She asks if he has that in his packet?

Mr. Jeitner states the only items he has, he apologizes some of these I just received this evening, he said the Fire Marshall, the Fire Marshall.

Mrs. Lindsey states there was a question regarding the Fire Department connection?

Mr. Jeitner states they will work with the Fire Department that bests that we see with the location of the building

Mrs. Lindsey says Ok

Mr. Jeitner states what makes sense with regards to where the drive aisles are around and wedging at the end of spots and around front, that is something I spoke with staff at the meeting and recommended setting up a meeting with the Fire Marshall and Building Planner to address the concerns they have.

Mrs. Lindsey says Ok.

Mr. Newsome asks when do they hope for ground breaking?

Mr. Jeitner responds I believe that they require all approvals, best scenario will be ground breaking in the Fall.

Mrs. Lindsey asks if it would be ready for the Holidays if they do that?

Mr. Jeitner responds with construction, most likely not. The construction schedule, the building feature, beyond the construction schedule once they have everything to go probably will need a month to do the training, new hires and all that so there is some added time. Depending how quick we get thru the process with the outside agency who we use as well. They would love to be open for the holidays.

Mr. Gingrich requests the memo of the Sewer Authority?

Mr. Jeitner states he does, I quickly reviewed it and nothing jumped out at me. The April 24 Lower Paxton Sewer Authority memo?

Mr. Gingrich replies states Yes.

Mr. Jeitner states that number 7 regarding the clearance we will take a look at that to specifically make sure we do not have any construction conflicts.

Mr. Lighty asks Staff Comments, any questions for Steve?

Mr. Jeitner states he didn't see anything in there he could not address.

Mr. Lighty responds anything else to add?

Mr. Jeitner states No, only the summary, the main items are really discussing the crossing, the configuration of the parking with the building locations and pedestrians, we will review the street tree requirements with the new plan and if a waiver is requested we will have a plan to discuss what point we fill at the next Planning Commission and if I heard correctly there may be some lee- way in regards to

providing the number of trees and maybe spacing them a bit along the site, that may be helpful; the main topic of concern is the main access way. As what the applicant is going to do and will do.

Mrs. Lindsey asks about the main access way and that there are 2 stop signs there now, are you just going to keep the 2 stop signs?

Mr. Jeitner states that he thinks it is part of the route that we are discussing, they are suggesting improving the way in but also improving the 3 way intersection.

Mrs. Lindsey states right

Mr. Jeitner states well that would be the plans that revised, we would still have that 3 way stop.

Mrs. Lindsey replies we have 2, as you come around the back of the building there is not a stop sign you have the right of way, but coming in you have a stop sign and coming from the Bon-Ton you have a stop sign.

Mr. Jeitner asks if that works?

Mrs. Lindsey replies No, that's why I asked. You have to be very careful.

Mr. Jeitner states he thinks he can work in concert with Steve.

Mrs. Lindsey just curious.

Mr. Lighty states he never ate at a Longhorn at the West Shore.

Mrs. Lindsey says she has and its very good. Yeah.

Mr. Jeitner states the landscape is nice. He will state that the clients is not here and the chains of the steakhouses they are probably one of the better ones. The atmosphere inside is nice. There were no comments offered from the audience.

Mr. Lighty -County Comments

Any one in audience want to comment.

Mr. Guise.-Steve anything more?

Mr. Grove Mrs. Lindsey seconds it.

All in favor say I

Items of New Business come forth

#### COMMISSIONER COMMENT

Mr. Lighty asked for comments from the Planning Commission members.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 5, 2013, at 7:00pm at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, Room 171.

Being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:00pm with a unanimous vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Michele Kwasnoski". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Michele Kwasnoski

Recording Secretary